UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/549,852	09/23/2005	Hans-Peter Buchstaller	24945-0023 7098	
49442 7590 07/16/2007 BAKER & DANIELS LLP		EXAMINER		
805 15TH STREET, NW, SUITE 700			CHU, YONG LIANG	
WASHINGTO	GTON, DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/549,852	BUCHSTALLER ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Yong Chu	1626			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from 1. cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1)⊠	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 April 2007</u> .					
,	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims	ţ				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are withdrawn Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>33</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) <u>33</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	n from consideration				
Applicati	ion Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 2.	epted or b) objected to by the ld drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•				
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)						
1) 🛛 Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D				
3) 🔯 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/05/2006</u> .	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 1626

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-33 are pending in the instant application.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement, filed on 06/05/2006, has been considered. Please refer to Applicant's copy of the PTO-1449 submitted herewith.

Priority

This application is a 371 of PCT/EP04/02406 filed on 03/09/2004, and claims the benefit of EP Patent Applications 03006702.9 filed on 03/24/2003.

Response to Lack of Unity

Applicants' election without traverse of the new Group of claim 33 and elected

specification in the reply filed on 04/27/2007 is acknowledged.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-32 are further withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner as being drawn to non-elected inventions under 37 CFR 1.142(b) due to the restriction requirement.

Art Unit: 1626

Elected and Examined Subject Matter

The scope of the invention of the elected subject matter and the examined subject matter is as follows:

$$(R^{B})_{p} - Ar^{1} + \bigcup_{Q} \bigvee_{(R^{9})_{Q}} X - Ar^{2} - (R^{10}),$$
 when

A compound of Formula (IIi)

 Ar^1 is phenyl; Ar^2 is pyridinyl; X is -O;

 R^8 is H, Hal, and C(Hal)₃; R^9 is H or alkyl; R^{10} is H, Hal, and C(Hal)₃;

p, r is independently from one another 0,1,2,3,4 or 5;

q is independently from one another 0,1,2,3, or 4, and

Hal is F, Cl, or Br, or pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof.

As a result of the election and the corresponding scope of the invention identified supra, claims the remaining subject matter of claim 33 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142 (b) as being drawn to non-elected inventions. The withdrawn compounds contain varying functional groups, which are chemically recognized to differ in structure, function, and reactivity.

Specification

The first paragraph of the specification does not contain continuing data to which the instant specification claims benefit from. An appropriate amendment is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "The compound according to claim 3, comprising formula IIi" is indefinite, because it is not clear how to define the compound by the openend transition phrase "comprising", thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. It is suggested to replace with "The compound of formula IIi".

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "the pharmaceutically acceptable derivatives" is indefinite, because it is not clear how to define the "derivative", thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. It is suggested to delete it unless there is a well-defined term for the compounds.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(b)

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Boger et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,656,183 (the `183 patent).

Art Unit: 1626

Applicants' claims relate to a compound of Formula (IIi)

$$(R^{8})_{p} - Ar^{1}$$
 $(R^{9})_{q}$
 $(R^{9})_{q}$
, wherein:

Ar¹ is phenyl;

Ar² is pyridinyl;

X is -0;

R⁸ is H, Hal, and C(Hal)₃;

R⁹ is H or alkyl;

R¹⁰ is H, Hal, and C(Hal)₃;

p, r is independently from one another 0,1,2,3,4 or 5;

q is independently from one another 0,1,2,3, or 4, and

Hal is F, Cl, or Br, or pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof.

The `183 patent (published on 04/07/1987) discloses the compound 35 (CAS RN

in columns 17-18, compound

in columns 11-12

6(CAS RN 98499-96-8)

, and the other compounds listed in columns 9-28.

Art Unit: 1626

Therefore, the prior art teaching anticipates the instant claim.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 33 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of copending Application No. 10/563,830. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 4 claims compounds of formulae IIa-IId containing the same core structure as the instantly claimed compounds.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Application/Control Number: 10/549,852 Page 7

Art Unit: 1626

Claim Objections

Claim 33 is objected to for containing elected and non-elected subject matter.

The elected subject matter has been identified supra.

Conclusion

- Claim 33 is objected.
- Claim 33 is rejected.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yong Chu whose telephone number is 571-272-5759. The examiner can normally be reached between 7:00 am - 3:30 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph K. M^eKane can be reached on 571-272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 1626

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Yong Chu, Ph.D. Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1626

Joseph K. M^{<u>º</u>}Kane

Supervisory Patent Examiner

KAMAL A. SAEED, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 1626